

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCY United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,132	10/23/2006	Glen Ernst	101240-1P US 8760	
22466 7590 10/02/2007 ASTRA ZENECA PHARMACEUTICALS LP			EXAMINER	
GLOBAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY 1800 CONCORD PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19850-5437			MURRAY, JEFFREY H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
	,			
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•			10/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No. Applicant(s)					
	10/573,132	ERNST ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeffrey H. Murray	1624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 h	March 2006.					
	s action is non-final.					
·—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	losed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 15</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 15</u> are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	ce Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
and an analysis as a second control and	2.					
Attachment(s)	o.□ o	(DTO 442)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) [_] Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/573,132 Page 2

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. The compound or composition of general Formula (I), wherein Q is a diazabicyclo[3.2.2]nonane, E is a six-membered heterocyclic ring with at least 2 heteroatoms, at least one being nitrogen as in Claims 1-3 and 11.
- II. The compound or composition of general Formula (I), wherein Q is a diazabicyclo[3.2.2]nonane, E is a six-membered heterocyclic ring with one nitrogen as in Claims 1-3 and 11.
- III. The compound or composition of general Formula (I), wherein Q is a diazabicyclo[3.2.2]nonane, E is a five-membered heterocyclic ring with at least one nitrogen as in Claims 1-3 and 11.
- IV. The compound or composition of general Formula (I), wherein Q is a diazabicyclo[3.2.2]nonane, E is a five- or six-membered sulfur or oxygen containing heterocyclic ring with no nitrogen ring members as in Claims 1-3 and 11.

Application/Control Number: 10/573,132

Art Unit: 1624

V. The compound or composition of general Formula (I), wherein Q is a diazabicyclo[3.2.2]nonane, E is a five-or six-membered aryl ring as in Claims 1-3 and 11.

Page 3

- VI. The compound or composition of general Formula (I), not previously described in Groups I-V as in Claims 1-3 and 11.
- VII-XII. A method of treatment or prophylaxis of diseases with a compound or composition of formula (I) as in Groups I-VI, according to Claim 4-10 and 12.
- XIII-XVIII. A method of making a compound or composition of formula (I) as in Groups I-VI, according to Claim 15.
- 2. The inventions listed as Groups I-XVIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking the claims is a compound of formula (I). Prior art exists which causes the core structure in the current application to lack a special technical feature. The core structure here is a 4-(methylene)-diazabicyclo[3.2.2]nonane ring. This ring system is seen in numerous patents and papers, for example: Bowen, et. al., U.S. Patent No. 5,679,673; which teaches a core compound wherein E is a methylene and D is a 3,4-dichlorophenyl group. (See RN 150235-80-6). Therefore the features linking the claims does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2 as it does not define a contribution over the art.

Art Unit: 1624

Accordingly, Groups I-XVIII are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept

- 3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

 All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.
- 4. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Page 5

Art Unit: 1624

5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: The various compounds of Claim 3 and the various disorders of Claim 12.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 1 and 4 are generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly

Page 6

and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected 6. invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/573,132

Art Unit: 1624

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey H. Murray whose telephone number is (571) 272-9023. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs 7:30-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached at 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JHM

James O. Wilson

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Page 7

Art Unit 1624